

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-17, 19-27, 29-38, 40, and 41 are pending in the application. Claims 21-27, 29-38, 40, and 41 have been withdrawn pursuant to a restriction/election of species requirements. Claims 9, 18, 28, and 39 have been cancelled by this amendment without prejudice. No claims are presently allowed.

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite that the coating does not exceed about 15 nanometers in thickness. Support for this amendment is found in paragraph 0025.

No new matter has been added.

Restriction

Applicants affirm the prior election of claims 1-20. Upon allowance of claim 1, Applicants request rejoinder of claims 21-27, 29, and 30 because these claims are drawn to a method of making the composite recited in claim 1. Upon allowance of claim 10, Applicants request rejoinder of claims 32-38, 40, and 41 because these claims are drawn to a method of using the capacitor recited in claim 31.

Interview Summary

In a personal interview on 02/22/07, the limitation of self-limiting electropolymerization was discussed. It was discussed that the claims could be amended to recite a coating thickness of 15 nm.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10, 11, and 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Bluvshstein et al. (US 2002/0089807).

In order to make a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the reference must disclose each limitation of the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP 2131. Among other deficiencies, the reference does not disclose the limitation in claims 1 and 10 at the coating does not exceed about 15 nanometers in thickness. The reference discloses no mechanism by which the thickness could be so limited. As the reference teaches that a high specific capacitance is desirable (0014) it would be expected that the thickness would be as large as possible, to the point of filling the pores near

the surface of the electrode.

As all the claim limitations are not disclosed in the reference, as *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been made. Claims 2, 4-6, 11, and 13-15 depend from and contain all the limitations of claims 1 or 10. The arguments regarding the lack of *prima facie* for claims 1 and 10 are applicable to claims 2, 4-6, 11, and 13-15.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 8, 12, 17, 19, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Bluvshstein.

In order to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness, each claim limitation must be disclosed in the references (MPEP 2143.03). As explained above, the reference does not disclose the limitation in claims 1 (3 and 8 dependent thereon) and 10 (12, 17, 19, and 20 dependent thereon) that the coating does not exceed about 15 nanometers in thickness. As all the claim limitations are not disclosed in the reference, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made.

Claims 7 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Bluvshstein in view of Shi (6,383,640).


The references do not disclose the limitation in claims 1 (7 dependent thereon) and 10 (16 dependent thereon) that the coating does not exceed about 15 nanometers in thickness. As all the claim limitations are not disclosed in the reference, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

In the event that a fee is required, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0281,

and in the event that there is a credit due. please credit Deposit Account No. 50-0281.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph T Grunkemeyer
Reg. No. 46,746
Phone No. 202-404-1556
Office of the Associate Counsel
(Patents), Code 1008.2
Naval Research Laboratory
4555 Overlook Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20375-5325